UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,396	02/04/2000	Saeed Anooshfar	03650.000140.	8772

5514   7590   12/24/2008
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/498,396	ANOOSHFAR, SAEED
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KRISTIE D. SHINGLES	2441	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 October 2008</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Per Applicant's Request for Continued Examination
Claims 1, 7 and 21 have been amended.
Claims 23-25 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

I.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/22/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

II.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, 21, 23 and 24 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

III.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if
the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would

have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV.   <u>Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 21 and 23-24</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
       unpatentable over *Hower Jr. et al* (US 5,467,434) in view of *Kumpf et al* (US
       6,289,371).

       a.   **Regarding claim 1,** *Hower Jr. et al* teach a computer network scanning system

for fulfilling a scan order over a computer network, said system comprising:

- at least one computer terminal adapted to invoke a scan order entry form, from an
  order entry server, for inputting a scanner node and a scan setting for causing the
  inputted scanner node to scan an image (*col.3 line 51-col.4 line 25—client device
  invokes print order at server and inputs printer settings for the printing the print
  job*);

- at least one order entry server computer configured to reconcile the inputted scan
  setting with a capability profile of the inputted scanner node to perform scanning
  and to create and distribute a scan order in accordance with the reconciliation
  result, each order entry server computer being coupled to said at least one
  computer terminal through the computer network (*col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines
  10-21, col.10 lines 12-14—server maintains configuration files and printer
  profiles for reconciling the print jobs with an appropriate printer based on the
  printer's properties*); and

- at least one scanner node, each scanner node being coupled to said at least one
  computer terminal and each order entry server computer through the computer
  network, each scanner node being configured to select a scan order from a
  plurality of scan orders received from at least one of the order entry servers
  through the computer network (*col.2 lines 40-50, col.3 lines 37-65, col.5 line 59-
  col.6 line 65, col.7 lines 30-32col.9 lines 24-30 and 37-63, col.10 lines 45-65—
  printers coupled to the client and server via the network, print jobs are added to
  the appropriate printer based on its properties and then selected from the print
  queue for printing*).

       Hower Jr. et al fail to explicitly teach inputting a destination for sending the

scanned image, wherein said one computer terminal is further adapted to accept input of the

scanner node, the scan setting and the destination via the invoked scan order entry form by the

user, wherein each scanner node being is configured to generate a scanned image based on the

selected scan order and to send the scanned image to the destination included in the selected scan order.

Although *Hower Jr. et al* teach a printing selection system and fail to explicitly teach a scanning system with scanner nodes and a scan order, the printing selection system is functional for other peripheral devices as well, including scanners. Nonetheless, *Kumpf et al* teach a system for distributing jobs to particular network peripheral devices, specifically scanners, wherein the distribution process involves determining which peripheral devices are capable and available for fulfilling the job based on their status and configuration information, wherein the scan image is sent to the address client and server address indicated in the scan order (*col.1 lines 4-19, col.3 lines 58-67, col.4 lines 17-67, col.6 lines 31-61*). *Kumpf et al* further teach a user inputting various scanner parameters for their scan job and selective a hard drive destination for the scan order (*col.5 line 43-col.6 line 28*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system in order to extend the setting-selection capability to scanners as well as printers, since it is well-known in the art that both serve as peripheral devices in the computing environment. Thus, incorporating the choosing of a desired peripheral device from among multiple network peripheral devices based on the properties of the peripheral devices, in relation to specific client orders, produces the same predictable result of the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is obvious for scanners (and other peripheral devices) to accept user input regarding the destination of the scanner job submitted by the user.

b.   **Per claim 7,** *Hower Jr. et al* teach a computer network scanning system for

fulfilling a scan order over a computer network having at least one scanner node, said method

comprising:

- creating the scan order in accordance with an operation at a local computer
  terminal, wherein through operation of the user the local computer terminal inputs
  a scanner node and a scan setting for causing the inputted scanner node to scan an
  image, and wherein the local computer causes an order entry server to reconcile
  the inputted scan setting with a capability profile of the inputted scanner node to
  perform scanning, and wherein the scan order is created in accordance with the
  reconciliation result (*col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-
  14—client device invokes print order at server and inputs printer settings for the
  printing the print job; server maintains configuration files and printer profiles for
  reconciling the print jobs with an appropriate printer based on the printer's
  properties*);

- submitting the created scan order to at least one scanner node for processing
  through the computer network (*col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines
  12-14*);

- displaying the identification of the inputted scan setting included in the scan order
  and processing the scan order at the scanner node by a user operation (*Abstract,
  col.4 lines 13-27*); and

- updating the scanner node(s) which processes the scan order on the computer
  network (*col.4 lines 13-27, col.9 lines 14-23*).

Yet *Hower Jr. et al* fail to explicitly teach a scanner/scanning system wherein the

scan order includes an identification of the inputted scan setting and the destination of at least

one individual selected from a group comprising (A) recipients of the scanned image, and (B)

recipients of notification of completion of the scan order, wherein the recipients of notification of

completion of the scan order may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiate the

scan order, and inputting a destination for sending information regarding the scanned image.

Although *Hower Jr. et al* teach a printing selection system and fail to explicitly

teach a scanning system with scanner nodes and a scan order, the printing selection system is

functional for other peripheral devices as well, including scanners. Nonetheless, *Kumpf et al* teach a system for distributing jobs to particular network peripheral devices, specifically scanners, wherein the distribution process involves determining which peripheral devices are capable and available for fulfilling the job based on their status and configuration information, wherein the scan image is sent to the address of the client and server address indicated in the scan order (*col.1 lines 4-19, col.3 lines 58-67, col.4 lines 17-67, col.6 lines 31-61*). *Kumpf et al* further teach a user inputting various scanner parameters for their scan job and selective a hard drive destination for the scan order (*col.5 line 43-col.6 line 28*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system in order to extend the setting-selection capability to scanners as well as printers, since it is well-known in the art that both serve as peripheral devices in the computing environment. It would have been obvious to send the scanned image to the client/server originating the scan order. Furthermore, it is obvious for scanners (and other peripheral devices) to accept user input regarding the destination of the scanner job submitted by the user.

c.   **Per claim 21,** *Hower Jr. et al* teach a computer network scanning method for fulfilling a scan order over a computer network having at least one scanner node, said method comprising:

- creating the scan order in accordance with an operation by a user at a local computer terminal, wherein through operation of the user the local computer terminal inputs a scanner node and a scan setting for causing the inputted scanner node to scan an image, and wherein the local computer causes an order entry server to reconcile the inputted scan setting with a capability profile of the inputted scanner node to perform scanning in accordance with the inputted scan

setting, and wherein the scan order is created in accordance with the reconciliation result (*col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14—client device invokes print order at server and inputs printer settings for the printing the print job; server maintains configuration files and printer profiles for reconciling the print jobs with an appropriate printer based on the printer's properties*);

- storing the created scan order in a central database (*col.4 lines 65-66*);

- retrieving the scan order for a scanner node through the computer network (*col.3 line 50-col.4 line 64*);

- displaying the identification of the inputted scan setting included in the retrieved scan order and processing the retrieved scan order at the scan order at the scanner node designated in the inputted scan setting (*Abstract, col.4 lines 13-27*); and

- updating the central database (*col.4 lines 13-27 and 65-66, col.9 lines 14-23*).

Yet *Hower Jr. et al* fail to explicitly teach a scanner/scanning system wherein the scan order includes an identification of the inputted scan setting and the destination of at least one individual selected from a group comprising (A) recipients of the scanned image, and (B) recipients of notification of completion of the scan order, wherein the recipients of notification of completion of the scan order may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiate the scan order, and inputting a destination for sending information regarding the scanned image.

Although *Hower Jr. et al* teach a printing selection system and fail to explicitly teach a scanning system with scanner nodes and a scan order, the printing selection system is functional for other peripheral devices as well, including scanners. Nonetheless, *Kumpf et al* teach a system for distributing jobs to particular network peripheral devices, specifically scanners, wherein the distribution process involves determining which peripheral devices are capable and available for fulfilling the job based on their status and configuration information, wherein the scan image is sent to the address client and server address indicated in the scan order

(*col.1 lines 4-19, col.3 lines 58-67, col.4 lines 17-67, col.6 lines 31-61*). *Kumpf et al* further teach a user inputting various scanner parameters for their scan job and selective a hard drive destination for the scan order (*col.5 line 43-col.6 line 28*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system in order to extend the setting-selection capability to scanners as well as printers, since it is well-known in the art that both serve as peripheral devices in the computing environment. It would have been obvious to send the scanned image to the client/server originating the scan order. Furthermore, it is obvious for scanners (and other peripheral devices) to accept user input regarding the destination of the scanner job submitted by the user.

d.   **Regarding claim 2,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the computer network scanning system of claim 1, *Hower Jr. et al* further teach the system further comprising a central database coupled via the computer network to each scanner node and to each terminal, the central database adapted to store and retrieve scan orders (*col.4 lines 65-66; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 1-20*).

e.   **Regarding claim 3,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the computer network scanning system of claim 1, *Kumpf et al* further teach wherein each terminal has associated therewith browser software for inputting scan orders (*col.2 lines 30-32*).

f.   **Regarding claim 5,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* the computer network scanning system of claim 4, *Hower Jr. et al* further teach wherein the scanner directory service module is a module selected from the group comprising (A) a database containing a capability

profile for each scanner node on the computer network, the database populated by entering a capability profile for each scanner node before using the database, and (B) a directory of capability profiles for the scanner nodes on the computer network generated on demand by a lookup/discovery software module (*col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14*).

g.   **Regarding claim 8,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the computer network scanning method of claim 7, wherein the step of creating the scan order comprises the substeps of accessing from an order entry server computer a user interface module which permits input of the scan order from the terminal (*Hower Jr. et al—col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.5 line 35-col.6 line 16*); inputting from the terminal a desired set of scanner settings and parameters through the user interface module (*Hower Jr. et al—col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al— col.2 lines 38-45, col.5 line 35-col.6 line 16*); reconciling the inputted scanner settings and parameters with a capability profile associated with each scanner node designated in the scan order (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al— col.7 lines 12-30, col.5 lines 23-65*); and converting the reconciled scanner settings and parameters into the scan order using a script writer module associated with the order entry server computer (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al—col.7 lines 12-30, col.5 lines 23-65, col.2 lines 38-49*).

h.   **Claim 9** is substantially similar to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

i.   **Regarding claim 10,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the method of claim 8, wherein the step of reconciling comprises the substeps of: (a) retrieving from a scanner

directory service module the capability profile for each of the scanner nodes in the designated

scan order (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et*

al—col.7 lines 12-30, col.5 lines 23-65); (b) comparing the retrieved capability profiles of the

scanner nodes with the scan order (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 28-61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10*

lines 12-14; Kumpf et al—col.7 lines 12-30, col.5 lines 23-65, col.2 lines 38-49); and (c) when

the scan order is inconsistent with a retrieved capability profile of a scanner node: (I) providing

notification of the inconsistency through the user interface (*Kumpf et al—col.4 lines 28-61*); and

(II) executing one step selected from the group comprising (A) the selection of an alternative

scanner node and repeating steps (a) through (c) above, and (B) the acceptance of the scanner

node with the associated capability profile (*Hower Jr. et al—col.6 lines 8-65; Kumpf et al—col.4*

lines 26-56, col.6 lines 42-67).

j.   **Regarding claim 12,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the method of claim

7, *Janse et al* further teach wherein the step of processing comprises the substeps of invoking a

scanning mode at the scanner node where the scan order is received (*Kumpf et al—col.5 lines 1-*

65, col.6 lines 42-65); parsing the scan order using a script interpreter module associated with

the scanner node (*Hower Jr. et al—col.6 lines 56-65; Kumpf et al—col.4 lines 26-56*); updating

a queue of scan orders at the scanner node using a process which eliminates from the queue all

scan orders that are time-expired or count-expired (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 41-48; Kumpf et*

al—col.8 lines 25-44, col.9 lines 21-28); prioritizing all scan orders in the updated queue

according to a predetermined algorithm; and listing the prioritized scan orders (*Hower Jr. et al—*

col.4 lines 41-48, col.7 lines 25-41).

V.   **Claims 4, 6, 11, 13-20 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpentantable over *Hower Jr. et al* (US 5,467,434) in view of *Kumpf et al* (US 6,289,371), in further view of *Janse et al* (US 7,215,434).

k.   **Regarding claim 4,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the computer network scanning system of claim 1, further teach wherein each order entry server computer comprises: a user interface module coupled to the computer network and adapted to receive scanner settings and parameters for the scan order from the terminal(s) (*Hower Jr. et al—col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.5 line 35-col.6 line 16*); a scanner directory service module coupled to the user interface module and configured to provide a capability profile for each scanner node on the computer network (*Hower Jr. et al— col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14, col.4 lines 65-66*); a scan order reconciler module coupled to the scanner directory service module and to the user interface module and adapted to receive scanner settings and parameters for the scan order inputted through the user interface module, the scan order reconciler module configured to compare a capability profile for a scanner node with the inputted scanner settings and parameters for consistency and to provide notification through the user interface module of any inconsistencies (*Hower Jr. et al—col.2 lines 40-50, col.3 line 37-col.4 line 12, col.5 line 59-col.6 line 65, col.7 lines 4-41, col.9 lines 24-30 and 37-63, col.10 lines 45-65; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.6 lines 42-67*); a script writer module coupled to and adapted to receive input from the scan order reconciler module and configured to create the scan order by translating scanner settings and parameters inputted from the terminal through the user interface module into a script that can be parsed by the scanner nodes (*Hower Jr. et al—col.2 lines 40-50, col.3 lines 37-66, col.5 line 59-*

col.6 line 65, col.7 lines 30-32, col.9 lines 14-63, col.10 lines 45-65; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.5 line 66-col.6 line 67).

Although *Kumpf et al* teach transferring the scan image to the user (*col.1 lines 4-19, col.3 lines 58-67, col.4 lines 17-67, col.6 lines 31-61*), *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* fail to teach an email server module adapted to receive the scan order from the script writer module and configured to send electronic mail messages to any address designated in the scan order and to send the scan order to any scanner node on the computer network. However, *Janse et al* teach communicating information relating to the scan order to the user via email (*col.6 lines 51-61*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system with *Janse et al* in order to extend the communication capabilities to include electronic mail as well as the web browser interface which is well-known network communication method.

l.   **Claims 18 and 19** are substantially similar to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

m.   **Regarding claim 6,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the computer network scanning system of claim 1, wherein each scanner node comprises: a user interface module (*Hower Jr. et al—col.3 line 51-col.4 line 61, col.5 lines 10-21, col.10 lines 12-14; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.5 line 35-col.6 line 16*); a script interpreter module for parsing the scan order in order to obtain scanner settings and parameters contained therein, the script interpreter module coupled to the user interface module (*Hower Jr. et al—col.2 lines 40-50, col.3 lines 37-66, col.5 line 59-col.6 line 65, col.7 lines 30-32, col.9 lines 14-63, col.10 lines 45-65; Kumpf et*

al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.4 lines 26-56, col.5 line 66-col.6 line 67); a scanner queue updater and sorter module coupled to the user interface and to the script interpreter module, the scan order queue updater and sorter module configured to update and sort a queue of a scanner node (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 28-48, col.9 lines 14-23; Kumpf et al—col.9 lines 5-28*); scanner driver module adapted to receive an output of the script interpreter module and to set settings and parameters of the scanner node based on the output (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 line 3-col.5 line 21; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-49, col.5 line 43-col.6 line 41*); a scanner module coupled to the scanner driver module and adapted to receive scanner settings and parameters from the scanner driver module and configured to produce a scanned image (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 line 3-col.5 line 21; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-49, col.5 line 43-col.6 line 41*).

Although *Kumpf et al* teach transferring the scan image to the user (*col.1 lines 4-19, col.3 lines 58-67, col.4 lines 17-67, col.6 lines 31-61*), *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* fail to teach an email server module coupled to the computer network, to the script interpreter module, and to the scanner module, the email server module configured to receive the scan order sent over the computer network, to send an electronic mail message containing the scanned image to any recipients indicated in the scan order, and to send an electronic mail message without the scanned image to any parties indicated in the scan order notifying such parties of the completion of the scan order. However, *Janse et al* teach communicating information relating to the scan order to the user via email (*col.6 lines 51-61*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system with *Janse et al* in order to

extend the communication capabilities to include electronic mail as well as the web browser interface which is well-known network communication method.

      n.   **Claims 11, 15, 17 and 20** are substantially similar to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

      o.   **Regarding claim 13,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the method of claim 12, teach wherein the step of updating a queue of scanner orders at a scanner node (*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 41-48; Kumpf et al—col.8 lines 25-44, col.9 lines 21-28*). Yet fail to explicitly teach the substeps of (a) determining whether the scan order has time-expired; (b) when time-expired, removing the scan order from the queue; (c) when not time-expired, determining whether the scan order has count expired; (d) when count-expired, removing the scan order from the queue; (e) when not count-expired, determining whether there is a count reduction notification associated with such scan order; and (f) when there is a count reduction notification, reduce count order associated with the scan order and repeat steps (a) through (f) above. However *Janse et al* teach (a) determining whether the scan order has time-expired (*col.9 lines 33 and 46-50*); (b) when time-expired, removing the scan order from the queue (*col.9 lines 33 and 46-65*); (c) when not time-expired, determining whether the scan order has count expired (*col.9 lines 39-46*); (d) when count-expired, removing the scan order from the queue (*col.9 lines 25-31*); (e) when not count-expired, determining whether there is a count reduction notification associated with such scan order (*col.9 lines 25-31*); and (f) when there is a count reduction notification, reduce count order associated with the scan order and repeat steps (a) through (f) above (*col.9 line 25-65*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system with *Janse et al* in order to modify the queuing system to with time-expirations and count-reduction techniques that are well-known and practiced in the art.

p.   **Regarding claim 14,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* each the method of claim 12, yet fail to explicitly teach wherein the predetermined algorithm is an algorithm selected from the group comprising (A) first-in first-out, (B) alphabetical, and (C) requestor-specified priority level. However *Janse et al* teach specific queuing techniques that include priority based on FIFO, etc (*col.9 lines 25-65*). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system with *Janse et al* in order to implement different types of queuing techniques, which is obvious and well-known in the art since all queuing to organized by some type of prioritized pattern.

q.   **Regarding claim 16,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* and *Janse et al* teach the method of claim 15, further teach the method wherein the step of setting the scanner node comprises the substeps of parsing the scan order using the script interpreter module associated with the scanner node (*Hower Jr. et al—col.2 lines 40-50, col.3 lines 37-66, col.5 line 59-col.6 line 65, col.7 lines 30-32, col.9 lines 14-63, col.10 lines 45-65; Kumpf et al—col.2 lines 38-45, col.4 lines 26-56, col.5 line 66-col.6 line 67*); and sending commands to a scanner driver module associated with the scanner node based upon information obtained from the parsed scan order

(*Hower Jr. et al—col.4 lines 41-48, col.7 lines 25-41; Kumpf et al—col.8 lines 25-44, col.9 lines 21-28*).

      r.   **Regarding claim 22,** *Hower Jr. et al* with *Kumpf et al* teach the method of claim 21, yet fail to explicitly wherein the step of updating the central database comprises deleting the scan order from the central database. However *Janse et al* teach deleting scan job types from the storage space after a time-out period has elapsed (*col.9 lines 64-67*). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hower Jr. et al's* printer selection system with *Kumpf et al's* network scanner peripheral selection system with *Janse et al* in order to remove old scan order from the database/storage after a period of time in order to provision storage space for newer scan orders.

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

VI.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Johnson et al (6248996), Chalstrom et al (6633913), Sakai (6469797), Cunningham (6208436).

VII.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTIE D. SHINGLES whose telephone number is (571)272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 8:00am-5:30pm.

      If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie D. Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2441

/KDS/
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444